



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

NK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,620	09/26/2001	Randall Mark Katz	267/172	2483

34263 7590 10/08/2003

O'MELVENY & MEYERS  
114 PACIFICA, SUITE 100  
IRVINE, CA 92618

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, BINH AN DUC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3713

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,620

Applicant(s)

KATZ ET AL.

Examiner

Binh-An D. Nguyen

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-57 and 65-89 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-36, drawn to a method for game play in a multi-level game of chance, classified in class 463, subclass 16.
  - II. Claims 37-46, drawn to a method of game play, classified in class 463, subclass 9.
  - III. Claims 47-57, drawn to a game of chance with multiple indicia from predefined set, classified in class 463, subclass 19.
  - IV. Claims 58-67, and 75-77, drawn to a lottery game and method, classified in class 463, subclass 17.
  - V. Claims 78-89, drawn to a method for entry by a player into a game played over an electronic communication system, classified in class 463, subclass 25.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II-V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as presenting a third random option as a player's further decision. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

3. Inventions II and III-V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as prompting the player for a second decision of whether to reveal the ultimate contain of the display. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

4. Inventions III and IV or V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as randomly selecting a second group of multiple indicia from the predefined set. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

5. Inventions IV and V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention IV has separate utility such as randomly selecting a target number from a first predefined range of numbers, having a . See MPEP § 806.05(d).

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

**In Group IV:**

Species S4a: claims 58-64.

Species S4b: claims 65-67.

Species S4c: claims 75-77.

**If Group IV is elected**, the applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, (i.e., Species S4a or S4b or s4c) for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 3713

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

8. During a telephone conversation with applicants' representative, Mr. David Murphy on September 29, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group IV, Species S4c, claims 58-64. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-57 and 65-89 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

10. The drawings are objected to as containing black and white photographs since it appears that the subject matter could be readily depicted in standard drawings.

Art Unit: 3713

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 58 is vague and indefinite since it is unclear whether the applicants solely claim on a lottery game or the applicants claim solely on a method for playing a lottery game. Note that, since the claims have been positively recited, they are hereby considered to be a method for playing a lottery game.

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3713

15. Claims 58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moody (6,475,085).

Moody teaches a lottery game comprising the steps of: randomly selecting a target number from a first range of numbers (first group) having a minimum and maximum number, presenting a indication of the target number to the player, selecting a number for the player, the number being selected from a second range (second group, low), having a minimum and maximum, receiving an indication from the player whether to draw again, and if so, randomly selecting a number from the second range, accumulating the total of the player's draws, and repeating this step until either the player declines to draw or the total exceeds the target number, and in the event the player declines to draw, randomly selecting numbers from the second range, accumulating those numbers, comparing them to the player's accumulated amount, and assigning as to the winner whomever has a total closest to, but not exceeding, the target; the first range has a minimum of 21 (3:48-56). See also Figure 1 and columns 1-6.

Moody does not explicitly teach the limitations of setting the range of where the maximum is equal to or less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the minimum of the first range (claim 58); the first range has a minimum of 20 (claim 59); the first range is from 20 to 50 (claim 61); the maximum of the first range is less than 100 (claim 62); the system indicates the odds that a draw will cause the player's total to exceed the target number (claim 63); the result is a push if the player's number and the system number are equal (claim 64). These limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a matter



Art Unit: 3713


of design choice and can be obviously derived from the lottery method of Moody. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Moody by setting different ranges of numbers and winning criteria to enhance a more interesting interactive lottery game thus attract more participants and bring forth profits.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh-An D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5713. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on 703-308-1327. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

BN

  
Teresa Walberg  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700